

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450' Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,465	07/25/2003	Wing H. Wong	016285-001220US	3238
20350 7:	590 09/06/2005		EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			HORLICK, KENNETH R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/627,465	WONG, WING H.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Kenneth R. Horlick	1637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 17-29 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 17-29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction and or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11 ☐ The oath or declaratio	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  r.  ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2006/3 pages).	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/627,465 Page 2

Art Unit: 1637

1. The specification is objected to because of the following informality: the continuation information must be updated to indicate abandonment of the parent '265 application.

- 2. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is confusing because "said plurality of sample fragments" lacks proper antecedent basis. Correction is required.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The language "third primer sequence" is considered as new matter. On page 7 of the Remarks filed 07/25/03, support is pointed to on pages 19 and 20 of the specification, as well as to Figs. 1A and 1B. However, it must be pointed out that although the specification on page 20 indicates that the linker may be a polynucleotide, there is no teaching or suggestion anywhere in the specification that such a possible polynucleotide should or could contain a primer

Application/Control Number: 10/627,465 Page 3

Art Unit: 1637

<u>sequence</u>. Thus, it is submitted that applicant was clearly not in possession of the claimed polynucleotide mixture comprising primer-tag-primer polynucleotides comprising three primer sequences.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 17-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,793. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims and the instant claims are related as species-genus.

5. Claims 17-29 are free of the prior art, but are rejected for other reasons. No claims are allowable.

Art Unit: 1637

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth R. Horlick whose telephone number is 571-272-0784. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kenneth R Horlick Primary Examiner Art Unit 1637

09/01/05